



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA  
ROCK HILL DIVISION**

CAROLYN J. HARRISON,  
Plaintiff,

vs.

MARS WRIGLEY COMPANY, LIBERTY  
MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY,  
WENDY COX, ALMA GOMEZ, and BRIAN  
COX,  
Defendants.

§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Civil Action No. 0:23-04038-MGL

---

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION  
AND DISMISSING CASE WITHOUT PREJUDICE  
AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS**

---

Plaintiff Carolyn J. Harrison (Harrison), proceeding pro se, filed this complaint against the above-named Defendants.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending this Court summarily dismiss the complaint in this case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court

may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on October 4, 2023. The Clerk of Court docketed Harrison's objections on October 18, 2023. The Court has reviewed the objections, but holds them to be without merit. It will therefore enter judgment accordingly.

This Court need not conduct a de novo review of the record "when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the [Magistrate Judge's] proposed findings and recommendations." *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982).

Here, Harrison has failed to present any specific objections to the Report. Harrison's objections amount to general disagreements with the Report's findings, and merely repeat claims the Magistrate Judge properly considered and addressed. To the extent Harrison has brought any new arguments in her objections, they are conclusory and so lacking in merit as not to require any discussion. Therefore, the Court will overrule Harrison's objections.

Nevertheless, in an abundance of caution, the Court has reviewed the Report and the record de novo. The Court agrees with the Magistrate Judge's treatment of Harrison's complaint in her Report.

Further, inasmuch as the Magistrate Judge warned Harrison of the consequences of failing to file specific objections, Report at 2, she has waived appellate review. *See Howard v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 932 F.2d 505, 508–09 (6th Cir. 1991) (holding general objections are insufficient to preserve appellate review).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court overrules Harrison's objections, adopts the Report, and incorporates it

herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court this case is **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and without issuance and service of process.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Signed this 23rd day of October 2023, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis  
MARY GEIGER LEWIS  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

\*\*\*\*\*

**NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL**

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.